The Classical Review

http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR

Manili Astronomicon. Liber II *Manili Astronomicon*. Liber II. Edidit H. W. Garrod. 1 vol. Pp. 166 + c. Oxford University Press, 1911. 10s. 6d. net.

T. Nicklin

The Classical Review / Volume 28 / Issue 08 / December 1914, pp 271 - 274
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00008209, Published online: 27 October 2009

tions of the MS. authorities, which he had already published in detail in *Mus. Rhen.* LXIV. (1909): he shows that the MSS. fall into three classes, of which the earliest (Monacensis) belongs to the end of the fourteenth century, while the Latin Translation (T) is probably to be ascribed to the age of William Moerbeke (thirteenth century). A specimen page of this Latin Translation is printed at the end of the Greek text. Since Bekker, scholars like L. Kayser, A. Nauck, F. Kern, and others have contributed to the emendation of the text of the *Hypotyposeis*; and the editor acknowledges his debt also to Chr. Jensen, G. Pasquali, H. Diels and others, for criticism and advice.

The second volume contains the text of *adv. mathematicos* (vii.-xi.), the earlier books of that collection being left over to a third volume. In a *Praefatio* of nineteen pages the editor deals with the sources of the text and with earlier editions. Besides the MSS. used for the first volume the chief authority for the text of these books is a thirteenth-century Laurentian codex, which M. Mutschmann 'Arthurum Kochalsky secutus ad Nebei hujus codicis optimi investigatoris honorem siglo N' ornat. Among the scholars whose names appear most frequently in the critical footnotes to the text are Kochalsky, L. Kayser, and V. Heintz. As the preface of the first volume is dated May, 1911, and that of this second volume February, 1914, it will be seen that the editor is making fairly quick progress; and, when completed, the work will be indispensable to all students of Sextus.

Proclus on the Cratylus is only a collection of excerpts, probably the work of a pupil. The frequent use of a plural verb after a neuter plural is a peculiarity of style which marks the writer as distinct from the composer of the Proclus Commentaries on the *Republic* and *Timaeus;* and this peculiarity, as M. Pasquali points out, he shares with the Aristotelian commentator Ammonius, a disciple of Proclus. A brief account of the MSS., mainly of fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, on which the text is based, is given in the *Praefatio*. The well-known names of Crönert and Kroll appear frequently in the critical foot-notes to the text, and a number of their suggestions are adopted by the editor.

Editors and translators since the sixteenth century have conspired to neglect the *Institutio Physica*, which M. Ritzenfeld here presents to us in the complete form of text, translation, and commentary. The alternative title of the work is *De Motu*, and since it deals with Aristotle's views in his *Physics* VI. and VIII. and *De Caelo* I. it may be commended to the attention of Aristotelians. For the construction of his text the editor is specially indebted to the researches of Kalbfleisch, to whom the volume is dedicated.

The author of the treatise, in 100 chapters, *De Perfectione Spirituali* (περὶ γνώσεως πνευματικῆς) was a Bishop of Photike in Illyria in the fifth century. As an example of the ethical teaching of the Churchmen of the period it is a work of some interest. Since Migne (vol. lxv.) gives only the Latin translation of Diadochus's work by Torres, the issue of this primary critical edition of the original Greek deserves notice.

R. G. B.

MANILI ASTRONOMICON. LIBER II.

Manili Astronomicon. Liber II. Edidit H. W. Garrod. 1 vol. Pp. 166+c. Oxford University Press, 1911. 10s. 6d. net.

It is a matter for congratulation that Professor Robinson Ellis' interest in the astrological works of the early Empire has descended to at least two scholars of this generation—Professor Housman and Mr. Garrod. There is much in classical literature for the understanding of which a competent acquaintance with ancient astrology is indispensable, and until we are agreed to slur over such passages and to read selections only from the ancient classics, it will remain necessary to cope, so far

as we can, with astronomical facts and astrological beliefs. Mr. Garrod has made a welcome and valuable contribution towards the revival of such knowledge amongst us. Besides giving us a text constructed on scientific lines, he has provided a translation, neither low and creeping nor crude and loose, whereby the reader can follow his author easily and with a conviction of certainty. Further, a copious commentary of some ninety pages discusses such points as a curious student might wish to have elucidated. The mass of matter dealt with in the volume precludes any possibility of touching upon any substantial portion of it, and it will be perhaps of most service here thoroughly to sift the interpretation put by the editor upon a well-known passage, from the six pages of comment on which a page has been selected for circulation as a specimen page of the work. Says Manilius (l. 507-9):

> Contra Capricornus in ipsum
> Convertit visus—quid enim mirabitur ille
> Maius, in Augusti felix cum fulserit ortum?

Yet not only Suetonius (*Aug.* 5) but Augustus himself (*ap.* Gellius xv. 7. 9) attests that the Emperor was born on a.d. IX. Kal. Octobr. This Breiter made 23 September — whereon Mr. Garrod waxes somewhat supercilious. But he has not observed that Breiter's figure is not the offspring of 'errors incidental to human frailty,' because 'nothing in the world is much harder than simple arithmetic.' The truth is that Breiter, like Professor Ginzel (*Hand. d. math. u. tech. Chronologie*, vol. 2, p. 271, where other references to modern authorities are to be found), believes that the dating is Julian, *i.e.* that till 45 B.C. Augustus' birthday was written a.d. VIII. and afterwards as a.d. IX. (Perhaps Ovid's date for the battle of Mutina is to be reconciled on similar lines with that found in the well-known letter to Cicero.) This apology for Breiter, however, is incidental to our enquiry. The vital issue is, how and why is it that Capricorn was the sign 'that shone happily on the rising of Augustus'? Our editor, with Professor Housman, is absolute that the sign horoscopating is the sign under which a man is born, according to the ancient astrologers. Other modern writers suppose that sign to be the one in which the sun stands at the man's birth. Both views, of course, make Manilius inexplicable.

Mr. Garrod seeks an escape by wild manipulation of the Calendar, of which more will be said in a moment. The true solution has escaped him, and his invocation of Dr. J. K. Fotheringham's help at this point suggests a doubt as to his own acquaintance with what is a necessary equipment for grappling with such problems. Till 1904 there was some excuse for the editor of a Latin classic who hesitated to attempt the casting of an ancient horoscope; but in that year Dr. P. V. Neugebauer published Tables for the Sun and Great Planets, and in 1905 for the Moon (Berlin: Ferd. Dümmler: Veröff. d. Kön. Astron. Rechen-Inst. zu Berlin). Before throwing over the straightforward interpretation of the passage, we must have before us the positions of these luminaries at the moment of birth stated for us by our authorities. But it will be well first to quote some lines from Manetho:

σάφα νῦν καταλέξω
ὁππόθεν ἐν γενέθλῃσι χρεὼν ζωῆς χρόνου ἀρχὴν
ἀνθρώποις φράζεσθ' ἠδ' ἔμπαλιν, ὁππόθι λήγει.
οὐ μὲν δὴ πάντεσσιν ὁμῶς μερόπεσσιν ἔοικεν
οἵης ἐκ χώρης ἐτέων λάζυσθαι ἀριθμόν·
ἄλλη γάρ θ' ἑτέρῃ γενέθλῃ ἄφεσις συνάρηρεν.
ὅσσοις μὲν Τιτὰν ἠοῖ ἔνι γεινομένοισιν
κέντρῳ ἐπεμβεβαὼς ἰνδάλλεται, ἐξ ἄρα κείνου
μοίρης ἄρχεσθαι βιότου χρόνον ἐξαριθμοῦντας·
νυκτερινῇ γενέθλῃ δὲ Σεληναίης ἀπὸ μοίρης.
ὁππότε δ' ἂν κέντρων ἐκτὸς δύο φῶτ' ἀποκλινθῇ,
ἠδ' ἄρ' ἐπὶ μοίρῃσι κατωφερέεσσι πόλοιο
νίσσηται προθέοντα, τότ' ἀστέρος ἄρχεο κείνου
ὅς ῥά τε δεσπόζει γενέθλης μέγα τε κράτος ἴσχει.
εἰ δ' ἄρα κἀκεῖνον λεύσσοις κλινθέντ' ἀπὸ κέντρου,
ἐξ ὥρης τότ' ἔπειτα χρόνων ἄφεσιν σύ γε φράζου.

The determination of the ruling star and sign then is not so simple as editors have supposed. The facts of Augustus' birth may now be stated. We are told by Suetonius that he was born *paullo ante solis exortum*, and about 22 September (Julian) the sun rises at Rome about a quarter to six. We may suppose the birth then to be at 5.30 a.m. or a little earlier. Since the Julian calendar was not then in force, we have, as the Julian equivalent of 22 Sept. (if our authorities' dating is not Julian), either 20 September according to Unger,[1] or 21 September according to Holzapfel and P. Groebe. It will be seen that this horoscope, while allowing either date, somewhat favours the latter. The star-positions are as follows for 5.30 a.m. at Rome in 63 B.C.:

Sept.	☉.	☽.	♄.	♅.
20.	174° 3′	262° 39′	30° 26′	103° 21′
21.	175° 3′	274° 31′	30° 23′	103° 31′
22.	176° 2′	286° 24′	30° 20′	103° 41′
	Libra.	♐ and ♑.	Taurus.	Cancer.

Sept.	♂.	♀.	☿.
20.		316° 18′	125° 59′
21.	33° 6′	317° 53′	130° 27′
22.		319° 28′	134° 54′
	Taurus.	Aquarius.	Leo.

where allowance is made for the ancient reckoning of the Signs from 7° earlier than they are reckoned to-day. If we allow for the latitude of Rome, we have approximately for the first degree of the various Houses in the Figure of the Heavens on the 21st:

*I. ♑ 22° with ☉ in it.	*VII. ♎ 22°.
II. ♒ 25°.	VIII. ♈ 25° with ♄ and ♂.
III. ♓ 4°.	IX. ♊ 4° with ♅.
*IV. ♈ 11° with ☽.	*X. ♋ 11°.
V. ♉ 10° with ♀.	XI. ♌ 10° with ☿.
VI. ♍ 4°.	XII. ♏ 4°.

* These houses are angles.

On the assumption that the Houses should be truly equidistant, this would be slightly altered, all the Houses beginning perhaps with 21° of their respective Signs.

When we ask what is the ruling star, since (as Shelburne saw) the birth is at night—the Sun being not risen—we have first in rank to consider whether the Moon is in an angle. She is, and therefore she dominates the horoscope, and the ruling Sign is accordingly Capricorn. Geminus notes 'nocturnis originibus favent luna Mars Venus, plus die possunt sol Saturnus Iuppiter, Mercurius varie et quomodo consensit aut visus est' (*Fragm.* iii. § 10). Theagenes would of course notice ☽△ ♄ and ♂, and ☉△♀ and ♅. (See too Manetho ii. 184 *ff.*, 361 *ff.*, 407 *ff.*, iii. 106 *ff.* and iv. 35 *ff.*)

Without further comment on this horoscope, and the way the ancients would interpret it, we may record the star-positions for Horace's birth, the date of which we know to have been 8 Dec. 65 B.C., equivalent to a Julian date of 2 December. The Sun was at noon that day in 247° 12′ (Sagittarius), the Moon in 54° 17′ (the Roman Gemini), Saturn 357° 0′ (the Roman Aries), Jupiter 32° 6′ (Taurus), Mars 10° 6′ (Aries), Venus 343° 52′ (Pisces) and Mercury 276° 9° (Capricorn). Since the Sun rose that day at Rome about 7.15, we may assign the birth to about 3 a.m. when, whichever[2] way the Houses be reckoned, we can have in the Ascendant Libra and part of Scorpio, and in the 4th House (an angle) and Lord of the Horoscope Mercury. Since Mars also is in an angle, and the birth is at night, Horace may have thought at first that Mars not Mercury was predominant. Thus are explained Horace's implication that he was a *vir Mercurialis* and his *seu Libra seu me Scorpios aspicit . . . seu Capricornus.*

It would be travelling too far outside the proper scope of this notice to show how it is possible to go further and to determine the year of Maecenas' birth: this must be reserved for a short separate paper in the future. Here we must be content to add, as a last proof that Mr. Garrod is mistaken in rejecting the usual transvaluation of the Roman calendar-dates, the fact that he has to juggle with express statements of Dio Cassius. 'It is certain,' he says, 'that

[1] In an appendix to my edition of *Cicero: Select Letters* (Blackwood) I have given the same equivalent for this date.

[2] If latitude be allowed for, we may have, *e.g.*, the Houses beginning I. with 165°, II. with 213°, III. with 248°, IV. with 273°, V. with 294°, and VI. with 316°.

(1) that year' (*i.e.* 41 B.C.) '*was* what we call a "Leap Year"; (2) it ended with a market day.' As to the first statement I will merely refer to Unger in Müller, *Hand. d. class. Wiss.*, p. 818; as to the second, the year could only end with a market day if Dio Cassius, xlviii. 33 § 4, is correct, and then it follows that Mr. Garrod cannot give 365 days for 42 B.C. but 365+1 days. With this goes the inference that the year 46 contained 422+23 days, and then the total days from 52 to 41 are 4424+1, which is quite in harmony with our authorities. Not a shadow of doubt can remain that the whole of the editor's discussion of Augustus' horoscope and of the Roman calendar is misguided.

But it would be misleading to leave this as the last word. The book, as we have already seen, is a thoroughly valuable piece of work, throwing such light as modern scholarship can dispense on a thorny and intricate subject, and as such it deserves a hearty welcome from all classical students.

T. NICKLIN.

As a pendant to this review, it may be permitted to mention two recent additions to the Teubner series, each deserving welcome and consideration, viz.:

Claudii Ptolemaei opera quae exstant omnia: vol. 2, opera astronomica minora, ed. J. L. HEIBERG (M. 9); and *Des Claudius Ptolemäus Handbuch der Astronomie.* Erster Band a. d. Griechischen übersetzt u. mit erklärenden Anmerkungen versehen, von KARL MANITIUS (M. 8 or M. 8.60).

THE CITY STATE IN ANCIENT ITALY.

The City State in Ancient Italy (*Der Staat der alten Italiker*). By DR. ARTHUR ROSENBERG. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1913. M. 4.

DR. ROSENBERG has made a lucid and interesting investigation of the forms of government which prevailed in pre-Roman times in the different Italian communities, and the essay deserves a hearty welcome. Though its title and size, like its style, are modest, it represents a substantial addition to our knowledge of ancient Italy and of the elements from which the Roman Republican Constitution was drawn; and it includes a very welcome sketch of the political institutions of Etruria. The author is familiar with the inscriptional record from all the districts, and his discussion of the Etruscan evidence is a welcome sign of the solid progress which has been made in recent years in the interpretation of that difficult language by the patient and able research of Herbig and Torp, and above all by the brilliant work of the late Professor Skutsch. As a pupil of Skutsch, Dr. Rosenberg has learnt to combine evidence of many different kinds and to treat that of tradition with respect instead of contempt—a lesson which indeed the present generation of scholars has been taught again and again by the continual confirmation of ancient testimony by modern excavation. A striking example will be found in the chapter on the origin of the Roman lictors, where the evidence of Livy and other writers as to the Etruscan origin of the Roman fasces is strikingly confirmed by the find of a bundle of twelve hollow iron rods tied on to a double-headed axe in the tomb of some distinguished person[1] at the Etruscan town Vetulonia). The archaeologists assign the tomb to the sixth century B.C., and in any case it is entirely free from all trace of Roman influence. The confirmation of a particular passage in Silius Italicus, who ascribes to this particular town the origin of the *fasces* (*Pun.* viii. 483 ff.), is perhaps accidental but curiously exact.

The book begins by a discussion of the Aedileship, which must originally have been a religious office, as the name indicates, and which the author by a

[1] Surely not himself a 'lictor,' *pace* the Italian excavators, as Dr. Rosenberg has realized (p. 8(note).